

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 21-23, 26-31, and 34-46 will remain pending in this application. Claims 41-46 are withdrawn from consideration. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. For example, the matter added to claims 21, 30, and 40 is supported in the Specification at least at page 11, lines 9-13.

Claims 21-23, 26-29, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Claims 21-23, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,240,444 (“Fin et al.”) in view of United States Patent No. 5,774,670 (“Montulli”) and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,473,798 (“Grosser, Jr. et al.”). Claim 40 stands rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and Grosser, Jr. et al., and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,115,040 (“Bladow et al.”) and Official Notice. Claims 27, 29, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and Grosser, Jr. et al., and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,021,491 (“Renaud”).

### ***Interview Summary***

Applicants’ representative, Mr. Allen Oh, and Examiner Aaron N. Strange participated in a telephonic interview on May 27, 2009, to discuss the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

Claims 21-23, 26-29, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to nonstatutory subject matter. As per claims 21 and 40, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that the claims are directed to a “host client computer” comprising a “browser application,” “a communications interface,” and a “shared view engine” and that no recited elements in either claim 21 or claim 40 are limited to hardware.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant has amended claims 21 and 40 to more explicitly recite hardware elements, such as a processor and a memory. In view

of these amendments, Applicant submits that claims 21 and 40 are now statutory, as they are directed to apparatuses. Claims 22-23 and 26-29, which depend from claim 21, are also statutory.

In view of at least the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 21-23, 26-29, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 21-23, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and further in view of Grosser, Jr. et al. As per claim 21, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Fin et al. discloses a host client computer substantially as claimed, but does not specifically disclose that required cookie data describing state information of the host client in relation to the server is provided, along with the requests, to the at least one slave client or that the communications link utilizes a tunneling protocol. Montulli is cited as disclosing a means of adding state information to HTTP, permitting web servers and clients to exchange state information for a variety of purposes. Grosser, Jr. et al. is cited as disclosing the use of a tunneling protocol over a communication link to protect communications between devices on that link. The rejection of claim 30 is understood to be based on similar reasoning as the rejection of claim 30.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 21 has been amended to recite the further limitation “wherein the shared view engine is configured to selectively direct at least one slave shared view engine resident in the at least one slave client computer to prevent the at least one slave client computer from requesting a Web site from the server.” This limitation is supported in the Specification at least at page 11, lines 9-14. By contrast, it is not seen where Fin et al., Montulli, or Grosser, Jr. et al. discloses this limitation, whether considered individually or in combination with one another. For example, while Fin et al. discloses a CCI redirector and a message redirector that send CCI events and data messages between clients, Fin et al. does not appear to disclose the capability of using a host client computer to prevent a slave client computer from requesting a Web site.

Accordingly, Fin et al., Montulli, and Grosser, Jr. et al. fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 21. Claim 21 is therefore patentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and further in view of Grosser, Jr. et al. Claims 22-23, 26, and 28 depend from claim 21 and are also patentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and further in view of Grosser, Jr. et al. at least by reason of their dependency from claim 21.

Similarly, claim 30 has been amended to recite the further limitation “using the shared view engine to selectively prevent the slave client computer from requesting a Web page.” The antecedent reference to “a shared view engine” locates the shared view engine in the host client computer. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 30 is patentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and further in view of Grosser, Jr. et al. for at least the same reasons as stated above in connection with claim 21. Claims 31, 34, and 37-39 depend from claim 30 and are also patentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and further in view of Grosser, Jr. et al. at least by reason of their dependency from claim 30.

Claim 40 stands rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and Grosser, Jr. et al., and further in view of Bladow et al. and Official Notice. The rejection is understood to be based in part on similar reasoning as stated in connection with the rejection of claim 21. In addition, Bladow et al. is cited as disclosing deleting cookie data upon receipt of a termination signal for a communication session. Further, Official Notice has been taken that saving a copy of a file and sequentially restoring the copy to eliminate any changes made to the file was old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 40 has been amended to recite the further limitation “wherein the slave shared view engine is configured to prevent the slave client computer from requesting content from the web server unless the host shared view engine directs the slave shared view engine to allow the slave client computer to request the content from the web server.” As discussed above in connection with claims 21 and 30, it is not seen where Fin et al., Montulli, or Grosser, Jr. et al. discloses this limitation, whether considered individually or in combination with one another. Nor is it seen where Bladow et al. discloses this limitation.

Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 40. Claim 40 is therefore patentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and Grosser, Jr. et al., and further in view of Bladow et al. and Official Notice.

Claims 27, 29, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and Grosser, Jr. et al., and further in view of Renaud. The rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Renaud discloses that web servers and clients may be connected using a variety of communications networks, including LANs and intranets.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Assuming *arguendo* that Renaud discloses connecting web servers and clients using LANs and intranets, Renaud nevertheless fails to disclose the other limitations of claims 21 and 30, from which claims 27, 29, 35, and 36 depend. In particular, Renaud fails to disclose the limitation “wherein the shared view engine is configured to selectively direct at least one slave shared view engine resident in the at least one slave client computer to prevent the at least one slave client computer from requesting a Web site from the server” (claim 21) and the limitation “using the shared view engine to selectively prevent the slave client computer from requesting a Web page” (claim 30).

Accordingly, claims 27, 29, 35, and 36 are patentable over Fin et al. in view of Montulli and Grosser, Jr. et al., and further in view of Renaud at least by reason of their dependency from claims 21 and 30.

Based at least on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21-23, 26-31, and 34-46 are patentable over the cited art of record, and requests reconsideration and removal of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-1210/126608.03  
**Application No.:** 10/068,816  
**Office Action Dated:** March 27, 2009

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: June 29, 2009

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/  
Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439